

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11-24, and 28-31 remain pending in the present application as amended. Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended to include subject matter including that which was formerly recited in claims 8 and 10, and 25 and 27, respectively. Accordingly, claims 8-10 and 25-27 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment. In particular, the newly recited language in claims 1 and 18 regarding the instructions may be found in the application as filed at least in connection with the canceled claims and also paragraph 0030 of the specification as filed (as published).

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has now rejected the claims under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Elza et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0230903) in view of Lindsey (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0121789). Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 103 rejection insofar as it may be applied to the claims as amended. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the Elza and Lindsey references both fail to disclose or even suggest that the executed instruction retrieves from a storage device electronic communications to a user and sends the retrieved electronic communications to an endpoint comprising another first client of the user different from the first client of the user, in the manner recited in independent claims 1 and 18 as amended.

Independent claim 1 recites a system for transporting agnostic pull mode messaging that requires a plurality of first clients of a particular user. As may be understood, each first client may differ from other first clients. For example, one first client of the user may be a desktop computer messaging service that communicates according to a first type of [first] communication protocol, while another first client of the user may be a handheld messaging service that communicates according to a second type of [first] communication protocol, while yet another first client of the user may be a mobile-phone based messaging service that communicates according to a third type of [first] communication protocol. Thus, if each client of the user were to communicate directly with a server engine to effectuate messaging, the server engine would

be required to be capable of communicating in each of the first, second, and third types of the first communication protocol. Of course, providing the server engine with such functionality becomes cumbersome and unwieldy, especially as the number of types of the first communication protocol that the server engine must handle grows.

Accordingly, and as recited in claim 1, each first client of the user has a corresponding first adapter with which the first client communicates according to the corresponding first communication protocol, and all of the adapters communicate with the server engine by way of a common second communication protocol. The corresponding first adapter for each first client receives the corresponding first message and sends the response to the corresponding first client using the corresponding first communication protocol indicating that the corresponding first message was received, generates a corresponding second message based on the corresponding first message, and sends the corresponding second message to the common server engine using the common second communication protocol. The common server engine receives each second message and executes at least one instruction based on the received second message.

As now recited in claim 1, the at least one executed instruction retrieves from a storage device electronic communications to the user, such as for example e-mail, voice mail, an instant message, etc., and sends the retrieved electronic communications to an endpoint comprising another first client of the user different from the first client of the user. Accordingly, if each first client accesses the common server engine to access email, for example, one first client of the user, such as a desktop application, for example, may send an instruction to the common server engine to direct same to deliver email to another first client of the user, such as for example a mobile device of the user. In effect, then, a user at one first client can direct the common server engine to deliver email to another first client of the user even if the user is not at such another first client.

Independent claim 18 as amended recites subject matter similar to that of claim 1, albeit in the form of a method.

The Elza and Lindsey references each show multiple clients accessing a server / server engine, as is best seen in Figs. 3 and 2, respectively. However, neither reference discloses or even suggests that one client of a user sends an instruction to retrieve from a storage device electronic communications to the user and send the retrieved electronic communications to an endpoint comprising another client of the user different from the first client of the user, as is now recited in claims 1 and 18.

The Examiner points to paragraphs 0077 and 0080 of the Elza reference as disclosing such a feature. However, such paragraphs in point of fact disclose that, in connection with a system for updating a central document simultaneously accessed by multiple clients, an update from one client to the central document is propagated to other clients so that a copy of the central document at each client can likewise be updated. Applicants respectfully submit that the propagated Elza updates are not retrieved electronic communications to the user, as is required by claims 1 and 18, and also that each propagated change is not the result of an instruction from a particular client to retrieve such electronic communications to the user, as is also required by claims 1 and 18. Instead, in the Elza system, the instruction from a client is an update to the central document, and what is propagated is the update itself.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the Elza and Lindsey references does not disclose or even suggest the use of adapters in the manner recited in claims 1 and 18 as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Elza and Lindsey references cannot be employed to make obvious such claims 1 and 18 as amended or any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-7, 11-17, 19-24, and 28-31. As a result, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2833/305223.01
Application No.: 10/750,191
Office Action Dated: December 11, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-7, 11-24, and 28-31 is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: March 11, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439